

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1, 10 and 15 are amended. No new matter is introduced.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-5, 7-13 15-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lin et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,292,582 (hereinafter *Lin*). In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claims 6, 14 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being un-patentable over *Lin* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,548 to Hekmatpour (hereinafter *Hekmatpour*). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 Fed. Cir. 1987).

Applicants respectfully submit that neither *Lin* nor *Hekmatpour*, applied separately or in combination, expressly or inherently discloses or suggests each and every element of the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Lin* does not disclose or suggest a method for analyzing a circuit design, as claimed. Independent claims 1, 10 and 15 recite, among other features “identifying solutions to the violations based on the symptoms using data in a solutions database, wherein the solutions database includes a list containing one or more violations and one or more solutions corresponding to the one or more violations contained in the list,” as presented. *Lin* does not disclose or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

*Lin* relates to a method and system for identifying defects in a semiconductor. As shown in Fig. 1, *Lin* provides a block diagram of an integrated defect detection, classification, diagnosis and repair system (IDDCDR System). As shown, wafer and/or manufacturing anomalies are detected and located by an anomaly detecting-and-locating system 1. Defects are identified, precisely located and classified by a defect classification system 2, and, after having been stored in a defect knowledgebase 50, the defects are diagnosed to determine their cause by a defect diagnosis system 3 and whose repair is determined and directed by a defect

repair system 4. Compression of information may be used throughout system shown in Fig. 1 to facilitate and enhance its operation. The Integrated Defect Detection/Classification/Diagnosis/Repair System may include a UNIX, DOS, Windows or other operating system and special purpose image generation, capture and server network modules installed in and/or controlled by a computer. *See e.g.*, col. 5, lines 27-43.

The Office Action at page 3 states that *Lin* teaches “generating a precise image of the repair...based on symptoms, using data stored in a repair knowledgebase (solutions database).” The Office Action appears to equate the claimed “solutions database” with a “repair knowledgebase” allegedly disclosed in *Lin*. However, Applicants do not find any reference to a “repair knowledgebase” in Fig. 26, the corresponding text to Fig. 26 (as suggested in the Office Action) or anywhere else in *Lin*. Moreover, *Lin* does not disclose or suggest at least a solutions database, “wherein the solutions database includes a list containing one or more violations and one or more solutions corresponding to the one or more violations,” as recited, among other features, in independent claims 1, 10 and 15. Moreover, *Lin* does not disclose or suggest “identifying solutions to the violations based on the symptoms using data in a solutions database,” as claimed.

*Hekmatpour* fails to overcome these defects of *Lin*. Since *Lin* does not disclose or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention and *Hekmatpour* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Lin*, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 10 and 15 (as presented) are in condition for allowance over applied art for at least these reasons.

Claims 2-9 depend from independent claim 1, claims 11-14 depend from independent claim 10, and claims 16-20 depend from independent claim 15. Therefore, claims 2-9, 11-14 and 16-20 are in condition for allowance for the reasons stated above and for the additional features recited therein.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, favorable reconsideration of all pending claims is requested. Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and request that a notice of allowance be issued.

It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including

fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's deposit account no. 08-2025.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is required to expedite the prosecution of this application or further clarify the issues, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Date: November 8, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Sean S. Wooden  
Registration No. 43,997  
**Andrews Kurth LLP**  
1701 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.  
Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20006  
Tel. (202) 662-2700  
Fax (202) 662-2739